
AGENDA ITEM No. 2

MINUTES

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <u>Meeting:</u> | Planning Committee |
| <u>Date:</u> | 8 August 2014 at 10.00am |
| <u>Venue:</u> | The Board Room, Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell |
| <u>Chair:</u> | Mr P Ancell |
| <u>Present:</u> | Clr D Birkinshaw, Clr P Brady, Clr C Carr, Clr D Chapman, Clr A Favell, Clr Mrs H M Gaddum, Clr Mrs N Hawkins, Clr H Laws, Ms S McGuire, Clr Mrs K Potter, Clr Mrs L Roberts, Clr S Wattam, Clr D Williams. |
| <u>Apologies for Absence:</u> | Clr A McCloy, Clr C Furness (deputising for Clr A McCloy), Clr Mrs J Twigg. |

96/14 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 July 2014 were approved as a correct record subject to the following amendment:

94/14

Correct the spelling of Clr Gaddum's name to Gaddum, not Gaddam
Query the finish time of the meeting

97/14 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Thirty seven members of the public had given notice to make representations to the meeting.

96/14 MEMBERS' DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

The Chair noted that all members apart from Clr Mrs N Hawkins had a personal interest in Item 6 as they had received email correspondence from Rowsely Parish Council and Mr H Griffith. Members had also received email correspondence from the Applicant in relation to Item 9. It was noted that Clr Mrs N Hawkins was currently unable to send or receive emails.

Members declared additional interests as below:

Item 6

- Ms S McGuire, personal interest as she had co-written the 2007 Stanton Moor Conservation Plan with the Authority's Cultural Heritage Manager.
- Clr Mrs K Potter, personal interest as she knew all of the people speaking in objection to the proposal. She also declared a personal interest as a member of CPRE and declared a further personal interest as she would be reading out a

statement about the impact of quarry operations upon the Scheduled Ancient Monument. Cllr Mrs Potter also declared a personal interest as she had attended the meeting of Rowsley Parish Council at which a member of the Stanton Moor Liaison Group had made a representation.

- Cllr D Chapman, personal interest as he knew Cllr H Campbell and Mrs J Kidd, who were speakers on the item.
- Cllr A Favell, personal interest as he had attended a meeting of the Stanton-in-Peak Parish Council with Jane Newman, Senior Minerals Planner. He had made no comments at the meeting and held an open mind on the application.

Item 8

- Cllr Mrs N Hawkins, personal interest as she knew Cllr J Hails, one of the speakers on the item.

Item 9

- Cllr Mrs K Potter, personal interest as a member of CPRE and as she knew all of the speakers on the item.

Item 11

- Ms S McGuire, personal interest as she knew Mr F Galbraith, one of the speakers on the item.

Cllr D Williams joined the meeting at 10.10am.

The Chair stated that he had received a note prior to the meeting, requesting deferral of the application. He was not prepared to agree to this request as the application had already been deferred from the committee of 11 July 2014 in order to carry out consultation with English Heritage and Rowsley Parish Council and this had now been completed.

97/14 6. FULL APPLICATION - CONSTRUCTION OF SAW SHED FOR TWO STONE CUTTING WIRE SAWS, CRANE AND WATER RECYCLING SYSTEM, DALE VIEW QUARRY, LEES ROAD, STANTON IN PEAK (NP/DDD/0214/0131, M3902, 04/02/2014, 425100 / 364000 /JEN)

It was noted that Members had visited the site on the previous day.

The Officer introduced the item and gave a number of updates including the following consultation response from Rowsley Parish Council, which objected to the proposals:

- The previous application had been deferred due to the lack of consultation with English Heritage and Rowsley Parish Council
- There was insufficient information in the previous report and Rowsley Parish Council (PC) maintained this was true of the current report – the PC requested more information and further consultation with itself and English Heritage
- The Applicant had failed to comply with planning conditions
- Rowsley PC supported the views of English Heritage and of the Authority's archaeologist. However, the Authority's proposal to allow this development on the site of a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) was questioned.
- There was a failure by the Authority to conserve the site of the SAM.
- The PC had no confidence that the doors would be kept closed during the operation of the saws.
- Daily operations were audible in the village.
- Concern over increased traffic movements on unsuitable minor roads and the

possible danger to school children.

- The proposed building would be visible from the highway.
- Why were Officers recommending approval when the previous application was recommended for refusal?
- Rowsley PC had been a statutory consultee since 2006 and was not against quarrying, but did want quarry operators to comply with policies and conditions.

The Officer stated that the previous application had been refused because the wire saws would have been out in the open and not confined to a building. He explained that in the current proposal, an automatic mechanism would make it physically impossible for the saws to operate unless the doors were closed.

He clarified two points in the recommendations. First, in Recommendation 2, the proposed hours of operation of the saws was 0730 to 1700 each day, Monday to Friday, not from 0730 on Monday without ceasing to 1700 on Friday.

Secondly, in Recommendation 3, the sheeting would be 9mm thick, with the specification given in the application being "20g".

He confirmed the Officer opinion that the design and location of the building was acceptable and that any noise and dust that would be generated during operation was within acceptable levels according to policy and guidance.

The Director of Planning confirmed that the Authority was not obliged to consult English Heritage (EH) as the proposed development would not directly affect the Scheduled Ancient Monument. However, Officers made a judgement that the Authority would consult EH on the current application following the 11 July planning committee. He stated that advice from the Authority's archaeologist was contained in the report and he read out in full the comments received from EH as follows:

- EH urged the Authority to ensure that any measure to contain noise pollution to protect the Scheduled Ancient Monument should be grounded in sound technical data and robustly controlled working practices. EH recommended that the application be determined on the basis of national and local policy guidance and on the basis of the Authority's specialist conservation advice.

He added that despite being consulted on the current application, the Environment Agency had not responded by the time of the meeting.

The following speakers made representations to the meeting in objection to the proposals:

- Cllr H Campbell, Stanton-in-Peak Parish Council
- Cllr G Green, South Darley Parish Council
- Mr G Henson
- Ms P Lloyd
- Mrs A Zoroudi
- Dr A Tickle, Friends of the Peak District
- Mr G Finch
- Ms S Fogg
- Mrs J Kidd
- Mr H Griffith

The Agent Mr C Nicoll spoke on behalf of the Applicant.

The Chair invited the Officer to respond to points made by the speakers.

The Officer stated that:

- An informal agreement had been in place for many years that quarry traffic should go through Stanton-in-Peak and Rowsley, not Darley Bridge. He knew of only one recent occurrence of traffic having to go through Darley Bridge and that was following a road accident.
- The proposed stone saws would be used for limited, partial processing of stone for quality checking, prior to the stone being sent out to customers. This would avoid unnecessary return of the stone to Dale View Quarry.
- The Environment Agency would ensure compliance with conditions governing the re-circulation of water used at the site for the damping down of dust.
- The doors would have an automatic mechanism preventing the operation of the saws if they were open.
- Any enforcement action would be controlled by fresh permissions as agreed by Members.
- The Applicant had provided a noise assessment and the Environmental Health Officer considered that the predicted noise and emission levels would be acceptable.
- The SAM is 250m away from the site of the proposed building.

The Director of Planning explained that the noise contour diagram provided by the Applicant was not new information but was available information presented in a different format.

A motion to refuse the application was moved and seconded.

It was noted that the Stanton Moor Liaison Group had been formed and had its first meeting earlier in the year, with the purpose of forging better relations between the operators, the residents of Stanton-in-Peak and the Authority.

A motion was moved to defer the item until more information about the crane and the history of the site was provided. Members were critical of the fact that there was no planning history in the report to which they could refer. The deferral motion was not seconded.

The Director of Planning suggested planning reasons that could be used for refusal as below:

- The impact of noise levels on the character, amenity and quiet enjoyment of the area and specifically upon the setting of the Scheduled Ancient Monument.
- The increased industrialisation of the site.

The motion for refusal of the application for the above reasons was voted upon and carried.

RESOLVED:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. **The noise levels would have an unacceptable impact on the character, amenity and enjoyment of the area and specifically upon the setting of the Scheduled Ancient Monument.**

2. The proposals would increase the industrialisation of the site.

A break was taken between 12.10 and 12.15pm.

The Chair announced that Item 7 would be moved to the end of the agenda as there were no public representations on it.

98/14 8. FULL APPLICATION - CHANGE OF USE OF AGRICULTURAL STONE BARN (PART) TO TWO DWELLINGS, BROWNSPIT FARM, LONGNOR (NP/SM/0414/0396, P.3225, 408580 363583, 22/04/2014/KW)

Clr A Favell declared a personal interest in that he knew Clr J Hails, a speaker on this item, but this would not affect his judgement.

The Chair noted that this application was considered at the meeting on 11 July 2014 following a site visit by Members. A decision had been deferred to allow Officers to discuss with the Applicant and his Agent the possibility of imposing occupancy restrictions on the smaller of the proposed dwellings. This would ensure that any approval would be in accordance with policy. Members had also expressed concerns about the relationship of the dwellings to the operational farmyard and to the buildings that abut the rear elevation.

The Officer stated that the Applicant had now agreed that the smaller building should be restricted to affordable needs use. In addition, the objection raised about neighbourliness at the previous committee would be dealt with by a Section 106 Agreement that would tie all of the buildings together to avoid any potential for conflict between different users. Consequently, the objections raised at the previous meeting had been addressed.

The following made representations to the meeting under the Public Participation Scheme:

- Clr J Hails, Supporter

Members took advice from Officers with regard to a request from the speaker that there should be no S106 Agreement and that the use of the proposed dwellings should be controlled by conditions only. Officers confirmed that the S106 Agreement was in accord with normal practice and would provide protection for the Authority in the event of any breach of condition. It would also give more flexibility to the Applicant through its cascade, which allowed a widening of the area from which an occupant could be selected should the initial area fail to provide someone who met all of the criteria.

The recommendation for approval was moved and seconded.

The Officer explained that planning policies required the inclusion of an obligation to provide local needs housing and the government target for making a Section 106 Agreement was 26 weeks. If the Applicant did not sign up to the Agreement within this period, the Authority should refuse the application. The Legal Officer stated that the 26 weeks should start from when the Agreement was prepared, which often could be up to two months from the committee decision date.

The recommendation for approval was voted upon and carried.

RESOLVED:

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to prior entry into a **Section 106** legal agreement within 6 months of the agreement being sent to the Applicant to prevent the separate sale of the two dwellings from the dwelling known as **Brownsplit Farm** and to the restriction of occupancy of one of the units to an affordable local needs dwelling, and subject to the following conditions:

1. **Development not to be carried out other than in complete accordance with specified submitted plans, subject to the following conditions.**
2. **Remove permitted development rights from the converted buildings for various types of domestic development, including any extensions, alterations, outbuildings and gates, walls and fences.**
3. **The conversion shall be carried out within the shell of the existing building,**
4. **Detailed design conditions, relating to doors, windows, rooflights, rainwater goods, including replacement of concrete lintels with reclaimed natural stone lintels.**
5. **Prior to the first occupation of the development the garden, parking and turning areas shall be provided in accordance with the amended plans and maintained in perpetuity.**

99/14 9. FULL APPLICATION – ERECTION OF A SINGLE EARTH-SHELTERED DWELLING, THE CHASE, COLDWELL END, YOULGRAVE (NP/DDD/0414/0419, P4421, 420514 364036, 16/04/2014/KW)

It was noted that Members had visited the site on the previous day.

The Director of Planning declared that he had formerly worked for the Applicant on a previous appeal in his last employment as a planning consultant and because the current application was for the same site and the same Applicant, he would leave the room and take no part in the debate. He left the meeting at 12.24pm.

The Officer introduced the report and gave the reasons for the recommendation of refusal. He stated that the Applicant had acknowledged that the legal agreement with the Youlgrave Community Land Trust was insufficient justification for the proposed development - the Authority could not enforce it. The Applicant had instead offered to place a Section 106 Agreement on the cottage that he owned in the village.

A representation in support of the proposal had been received since the report was written. It was from the Chair of Harthill Parish Council but was submitted in a personal capacity. The points made were:

- The legal agreement with Youlgrave Community Land Trust was enforceable
- The visible part of the proposals would conserve and enhance the site
- The site was unique
- The design was a 'flagship for innovation'

The following made representations of support to the meeting under the Public Participation Scheme:

- Dr A Tickle, Friends of the Peak District
- Ms A Croasdell, Secretary of the Youlgrave Community Land Trust
- Mr A Baker, Applicant

A motion to defer the item pending further analysis of the legal agreement between the Applicant and the Youlgrave Community Land Trust was moved and seconded.

A motion to approve the application was moved on the basis that the proposal fell within policy HC1-C2. The motion included a requirement that a condition be added to protect the elm trees in the hay meadow to the west of the site through the use of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). This was not seconded.

In accordance with Standing Orders Part 1.10, the meeting voted to continue beyond three hours.

A motion to defer the application pending further analysis of the requirement for a Section 106 legal agreement between the applicant and the Authority and further analysis of whether the development was in conformity with policy HC1-C2 was then moved, seconded, voted upon and carried with an indication that the committee were minded to approve the application.

RESOLVED:

That the item be DEFERRED pending submission of a further report to the next Committee addressing the legal and policy issues cited in the motion that was carried.

The committee broke for lunch at 1.15pm and reconvened at 1.45pm.

Chair: Mr P Ancell

Present: Cllr D Birkinshaw, Cllr P Brady, Cllr D Chapman, Cllr A Favell,
Cllr Mrs H M Gaddum, Cllr Mrs N Hawkins, Ms S McGuire,
Cllr Mrs K Potter, Cllr Mrs L Roberts, Cllr S Wattam, Cllr D Williams.

Apologies for Absence: Cllr C Carr, Cllr C Furness, Cllr H Laws, Cllr A McCloy, Cllr Mrs J Twigg.

**100/14 10. FULL APPLICATION – CHANGE OF USE FROM B1 USE TO D1 FOR USE AS A
FOODBANK STORE, CHURCH AND COMMUNITY USE AT UNIT 2, STATION
YARD, BAKEWELL. (NP/DDD/0514/0484 42222 / 368996 P1911 SPW 28/7/2014)**

The Officer introduced the report and explained the reasons for the recommendation of approval. He also confirmed that there were other similar vacant units in the town of Bakewell and that the current lease on the unit in question was for a period of one year.

A correction was made on page 2 of the report under 'Consultations'. The Officer amended the final sentence of the first paragraph (referring to comments from Bakewell Town Council) to say 'the economy is now growing'.

The following made representations of support to the meeting under the Public Participation Scheme:

- Mr R Williams-Menllove
- Mr R Hamilton
- Rev B Brown, Applicant

The recommendation of approval was moved and seconded, subject to the amended wording to condition 4 so that it would be clear this restriction applied to members of the church congregation as well as the general public.

The motion for approval was voted upon and carried.

RESOLVED:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions/modifications:

1. **Standard time limit**
2. **The use hereby permitted shall be temporary for 5 years.**
3. **Use shall be limited to a mixed use comprising storage for the goods associated with a foodbank, a church and community centre and for no other purposes within use class D1.**
4. **Restrict hours where visiting members of the public can access the premises to Monday to Saturday 18:00-21:00, Sunday 10:00-19:00.**

101/14 12. FULL APPLICATION – CONSTRUCTION OF NEW DWELLING FOR KEY WORKER AT LAND ADJACENT TO EDGE MOOR, THE EDGE, EYAM (NP/DDD/0414/0358, P.1710, 421571 / 376698, 23/07/2014/AM)

The Officer introduced the report and explained the reasons for the recommendation of refusal.

The following made representations of support to the meeting under the Public Participation Scheme:

- Mr P Nuttall
- Mr P Wigglesworth, Agent

The Officer recommendation of refusal was moved, seconded, voted upon and carried.

RESOLVED:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. **The proposed dwelling is not required to meet the eligible local need for affordable housing or the essential functional need of an agricultural, forestry or other rural enterprise. Therefore, approval of the proposed development would represent unsustainable development contrary to Core Strategy policies DS1 and HC1, saved Local Plan policies LH1 and LH2 and the National Planning Policy Framework.**
2. **The proposed development would harm the setting of The Ruins of Bradshaw Hall (a grade II listed building) and the significance of the designated Eyam Conservation Area, contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP3 and L3, saved Local Plan policies LC4, LC5, LC6 and LC16, adopted design guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework.**

3. **The proposed development would lead to the substantial intensification in use of an existing substandard access to Hawkhill Road (CIII) where exit visibility is severely restricted due to road alignment and existing boundary treatments. Approval of the proposed development would therefore be likely to interfere with the safe and efficient movement of vehicular and pedestrian traffic on the adjoining highway, contrary to Core Strategy policy GSP3 and saved Local Plan policy LT18.**

Clr Mrs N Hawkins left the meeting at 2.35pm.

102/14 11. FULL APPLICATION – CHANGE OF USE FROM SHOP (A1) TO MIXED A3/A5 USE (FOOD & DRINK/HOT FOOD TAKEAWAY) AT COUNTRY CHOICE, MAIN ROAD, GRINDLEFORD (NP/DDD/0414/0362, P.11009, 04.04.14, 424382 377692/TC)

The Chair apologised to the 15 speakers for the delay in considering this item.

The Director of Planning referred to the site visit undertaken by Members on the previous day and explained the ways in which the current application differed from the previous one.

The Officer noted that on appeal, the Planning Inspector had concluded that the loss of the village shop was acceptable but that the impact on the amenity of the area was not.

Since the report had been written, two further representations had been submitted:

- A letter from Mrs J Howard of Upper Padley raised objections similar to those already received.
- An email from Mr S Slingford saying that the premises should be kept as a village shop.

The following made representations of objection to the meeting under the Public Participation Scheme:

- Clr P O'Brien, Grindleford Parish Council
- Mr T Shepherd
- Mr A Battye
- Ms E Wood
- Ms S Fairbrother
- Mr D Hunston
- Mr F Galbraith
- Ms F Stout on behalf of Mrs L Bagley
- Mr McDonald
- Ms J Jacobson
- Mr H Molineux
- Prof D Allerton
- Mr T Higginbottom
- Ms J Ashmore
- Mr D Ross – letter read out by Mr H Molineux

A motion to refuse the application was moved, seconded, voted upon and carried.

RESOLVED:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. **Unacceptable impact on the living conditions of local residents**
2. **Visual impact of the flue**
3. **Amenity issues caused by parking on the road**

103/14 13. FULL APPLICATION - CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACEMENT DWELLING AT GORSE HILL, GORSE BANK LANE, BASLOW (NP/DDD/0514/0538, P.9543, 425632 / 372749, 28/07/2014/AM)

The Officer introduced the report and confirmed that the current planning permission for this site was valid for two more years.

Clr P Brady declared a personal interest as the speaker was representing his son-in-law in another matter.

The following made a representation to the meeting under the Public Participation Scheme:

- Mr N Marriott, Agent

The recommendation of approval was moved, seconded, voted upon and carried.

RESOLVED:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. **Statutory 3 year time limit for implementation.**
2. **Development not to be carried out otherwise than in accordance with specified amended plans.**
3. **Removal of permitted development rights for external alterations, extensions outbuildings, hard standing, walls, fences and other means of enclosure to approved dwelling.**
4. **Development shall be built to a minimum of the Government's Code Level for Sustainable Homes Level (or its successor) required of Registered Social Landlords at the time of commencement of the building works.**
5. **No development shall take place until a design stage assessment (under the Code for Sustainable Homes or its successor) has been carried out and a copy of the summary score sheet and Interim Code Certificate indicating that the development can achieve the stipulated final Code Level (or any such national mechanism that replaces this) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the National Park Authority.**
6. **Prior to the occupation of the dwelling hereby approved, a copy of the summary score sheet and Post Construction Review Certificate (under the Code for Sustainable Homes or its successor) shall be submitted to the Authority verifying that the agreed standards have been met.**
7. **Detailed scheme of landscaping (including planting, earth mounding, re-seeding, walls, gates and hard standing) to be submitted and implemented as part of the development.**

8. Any new services to be placed underground.
9. Conditions to specify or require prior approval of architectural and design details for the dwelling including, stonework, frameless glass system, roof materials, windows and door design and finish, roof lights and rainwater goods.
10. Prior approval of space within the site for accommodation, storage of plant, materials and parking for site operative's vehicles during construction works.
11. Prior approval of bin storage space.
12. Parking and turning areas to be laid and constructed prior to occupation and maintained in perpetuity.
13. Garaging to be retained for the parking of domestic vehicles in perpetuity.
14. If any alterations are carried out to the access, the new access shall not be gated within 5m of the highway limits and open inwards only.

Footnote re protected species.

104/14 14. FULL APPLICATION – RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR CONVERSION OF AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS TO DWELLING TO BE USED EITHER AS A RESIDENTIAL ANNEX OR HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION ANCILLARY TO BROADWOOD FARM, HATHERSAGE (NP/DDD/0514/0501, P.8567, 423806 / 380993, 25/07/2014/AM)

The Director of Planning explained that in his last employment as a planning consultant he had worked for the applicant on an appeal for a house extension. However, because the current application was not for the same site and proposal, he did not consider that he had a prejudicial interest. He therefore remained in the room.

This application sought retrospective planning permission for works already carried out.

The following made a representation to the meeting under the Public Participation Scheme:

- Mr J Oldfield, Agent

A motion to add a condition requiring the submission and agreement of surfacing details for the path to the buildings was moved and seconded.

The Officer recommendation with the additional condition was moved, seconded, voted upon and carried.

RESOLVED:

That the application be APPROVED subject to prior entry into a S106 legal agreement to prevent the sale of the barn and adjacent outbuildings separate from the dwelling known as Broadwood Farm and to prevent the installation of separate services, and subject to the following conditions:

1. Development not be carried out other than in complete accordance with specified amended plans.

2. Prior to the first occupation of the development, the existing access to Sheffield Road shall be modified in accordance with the amended plans with the area in advance of the sightlines maintained clear in perpetuity.
3. Prior to the first occupation of the development the parking and turning areas shall be provided in accordance with the amended plans and maintained in perpetuity.
4. Prior to the first occupation of the development appropriate foul water drainage and treatment facilities shall be installed in accordance with a scheme which shall have first been submitted to and agreed in writing.
5. The planting shown on the approved plans shall be carried out within the first planting seasons following completion or occupation of the development. The walling and surfacing shown on the approved plans shall be completed before the development is first occupied and maintained in perpetuity.
6. Prior to the first occupation of the development the windows and doors of converted buildings shall be re-painted in accordance with a scheme which shall have first been submitted to and agreed in writing.
7. Prior to the first occupation of the development the existing roof lights shall be removed and replaced with flush fitting conservation roof lights in accordance with the approved plans.
8. Remove permitted development rights from the converted buildings for extensions, alterations, outbuildings and gates, walls and fences.
9. Restrict occupation of the approved development to either additional residential accommodation or short-let holiday accommodation ancillary to Broadwood Farm. Occupation of holiday accommodation to be limited to no more than 28 days per calendar year for any individual. Approved accommodation shall not be occupied as an independent dwelling and shall be retained with the existing dwelling within a single planning unit.
10. The single storey outbuilding and the ground floor of the two storey outbuilding annotated as 'Store' shall be retained for domestic storage in perpetuity.
11. No cars shall be parked within the application site other than in the parking spaces shown on the approved plans.
12. All new service lines associated with the approved development and on land with the applicant's ownership and control, shall be placed underground and the ground restored to its original condition thereafter.
13. There shall be no external lighting and the converted buildings and associated curtilage shall not be provided with any other external source of illumination at any time during the lifetime of the development hereby approved.
14. There shall be no gates or other barriers within 5.0m of the nearside highway boundary and any gates shall open inwards only.

15. The access drive to Sheffield Road shall be no steeper than 1 in 14 for the first 5.0m from the nearside highway boundary and 1 in 10 thereafter.
16. Surfacing details for the path to the buildings to be submitted and agreed.

105/14 15. ADDITIONAL ISSUE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES DPD – RECREATION HUBS (BJT/A.6101)

The Policy Planning Manager introduced the report.

Members sought more detail and clarity in the draft document. The Director of Planning suggested that the Chair and Vice Chair of planning committee should work with the Officer and two other Members (Ms S McGuire and Cllr P Brady) to agree on any changes. After this, the document should be sent out for consultation again.

These suggestions would be reflected in a modified recommendation 2.

The recommendations as amended were moved, seconded, voted upon and carried.

RESOLVED:

That:

1. The Planning Committee agrees the consultation document for recreation hubs.
2. Delegated authority is granted to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of Planning Committee plus Ms S McGuire and Cllr P Brady, to agree the consultation document for recreation hubs.

106/14 16. CHAPEL-EN-LE-FRITH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN EXAMINATION DRAFT (AM)

Members expressed thanks to Adele Metcalfe and other Officers for their hard work in the preparation of the draft document.

The recommendation was moved, seconded, voted upon and carried.

RESOLVED:

Members agree that:

1. The 'examination draft' Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan (with supporting documents) does comply with the criteria for a neighbourhood plan.
2. Subject to the findings of an independent 'health check', the Authority shall work with High Peak Borough Council to undertake notification, public consultation and examination.

107/14 7. APPLICATION FOR POSTPONEMENT OF PERIODIC REVIEW OF MINERAL PLANNING PERMISSION NP/DDD/0598/214, WATTSCLIFFE QUARRY, ELTON (M3900, 422130 / 362090 / NR)

The Minerals Team Manager introduced the report and confirmed that the Authority determined when to take such periodic reviews. There was no obligation on the Authority to consult anyone else in these matters.

The recommendation was moved, seconded, voted upon and carried.

RESOLVED:

1. That the revised legal framework for reviews of mineral planning permissions be noted.
2. That the request for postponement of the first periodic review in respect of mineral planning permission NP/DDD/0598/214, at Wattscliffe Quarry, Elton, for a period of 10 years be granted.

108/14 17. PLANNING APPEALS (A.1536/AMC)

RESOLVED:

1. That the report be received.

The meeting concluded at 5pm.